REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-10, 12-14, and 16-27 are all of the claims presently pending in the application. Applicants have canceled claim 7 without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants have amended claims 1, 8, and 22-26 to define the claimed invention more particularly.

It is noted that the claim amendments are made only for more particularly pointing out the invention, and not for distinguishing the invention over the prior art, narrowing the claims or for any statutory requirements of patentability. Further, Applicants specifically state that no amendment to any claim herein should be construed as a disclaimer of any interest in or right to an equivalent of any element or feature of the amended claim.

Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-10, 12-14, 16-19, and 22-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Munyan (U.S. Patent No. 5,761,785). Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Munyan in view of Liao (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0021681). Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Munyan. Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Munyan in view of Stanek (U.S. Patent No. 5,936,554).

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections in the following discussion.

I. THE STATUTORY SUBJECT MATTER REJECTION

The Examiner has rejected claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the Examiner alleges, "Applicant's disclosure (Page 16, line 13 to Page 17, line 4) defines "storage media" to include mediums which do not form the basic statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101." (See Office Action dated

August 6, 2008 at page 2).

Applicants submit that the Examiner's rejection is vague as it does not set forth which mediums defined in the Specification allegedly do not form statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. §101.

Applicants point out that claim 22 recites: "A programmable storage medium tangibly embodying a program of machine-readable instructions executable by a digital processor for ...."

As such, because of the wording "tangibly embodying", this description clearly addresses at least the signal-bearing media that are physically embodied, including at least memory embodiments on a computer, such as a hard drive or RAM, that are storing the program either for actually executing the method of the program or for storing the program for potentially execution at some future time. Likewise, this wording also covers the tangible embodiments of a standalone diskette, such as a floppy or CD, as based upon *In re Beauregard*, 53 F.3d 1583 (Fed Cir, 1995), and subsequently-issued US Patent No. 5,710,578 that issued on January 20, 1998, to Beauregard et al.

Therefore, the claimed invention of exemplary claim 22 is directed to statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. §101. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

II. THE PRIOR ART REFERENCES

A. The Munyan Reference

The Examiner alleges that Munyan teaches the claimed invention of claims 1, 2, 4, 6-10, 12-14, 16-20, and 22-27. Applicant submits, however, that Munyan does not teach or

suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

That is, Munyan does not teach or suggest, "*wherein only said touch-sensitive display is touch-sensitive*", as recited in exemplary claim 1 and similarly recited in exemplary claims 8 and 22.

According to the claimed invention (e.g., as defined in exemplary claim 1), the computing device includes two displays, wherein one of the displays is touch sensitive and the other display is **not** touch sensitive.

In stark contrast, Munyan clearly teaches "two abutting touch-sensitive display screens 20 and 30" (see Munyan at column 6, lines 22-25).

Accordingly, Munyan clearly does not teach or suggest, "*wherein only said touch-sensitive display is touch-sensitive*", as recited in exemplary claim 1 and similarly recited in exemplary claims 8 and 22.

Moreover, Munyan does not teach or suggest, "*wherein said touch-sensitive display displays a reconfigurable user-interface that overlays a portion of said single display output*", as recited in exemplary claim 23 and similarly recited in exemplary claims 24 and 25.

In rejecting dependent claim 6, the Examiner alleges that Munyan discloses, "wherein the user-interface is reconfigurable in accordance with an instruction from a software application." (See Office Action dated August 6, 2008 at pages 3-4). The Examiner, however, is incorrect.

The claimed invention includes a touch-sensitive display (e.g., 310) having a user-interface (e.g., 320) displayed thereon (e.g., see Application at Figure 3). According to certain exemplary embodiments of the claimed invention, the user-interface may include a keyboard.

According to the claimed invention, the user-interface is reconfigurable. That is, the

user-interface is customizable/reconfigurable based on a program being executed on the computing device. For example, in the exemplary embodiment wherein the user-interface includes a keyboard, the appearance and/or configuration of the keys in the keyboard may be changed depending on the program being executed on the computing device.

In stark contrast, Munyan merely teaches that the text being displayed on the displays 20 and 30 may be changed (e.g., see Munyan at column 7, lines 13-32 and column 8, lines 35-57). Munyan does not teach or suggest reconfiguring the user interface.

Therefore, Applicant submits that Munyan does not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

B. The Secondary References

The Examiner alleges that one of ordinary skill in the art would have combined Liao with Munyan to teach the claimed invention of claim 5. Furthermore, the Examiner alleges that one of ordinary skill in the art would have combined Stanek with Munyan to teach the claimed invention of claim 21. Applicant submits, however, that, even if combined, the alleged combinations of references would not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

That is, Applicants submits that claims 5 and 21 are allowable at least based on similar reasons to those set forth above, in section A, with respect to claims 1, 2, 4, 6-10, 12-14, 16-20, and 22-27.

Therefore, Applicant submits that, even if combined, the alleged combination of references would not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw these rejections.

III. FORMAL MATTERS AND CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submit that claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-10, 12-14, and 16-27, all of the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, Applicant requests the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary in a telephonic or personal interview.

The undersigned authorizes the Commissioner to charge any deficiency in fees or to credit any overpayment in fees to Attorney's Deposit Account No. 50-0481.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: September 12, 2008

Scott M. Tulino, Esq.
Registration No. 48,317

Sean M. McGinn, Esq.
Registration No. 34,386

MCGINN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
LAW GROUP, PLLC
8321 Old Courthouse Road, Suite 200
Vienna, VA 22182-3817
(703) 761-4100
Customer No. 21254

Serial No. 10/718,642 13
Docket No. YOR920030362US1
(YOR.488)

FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that I am filing this paper via facsimile, to Group Art Unit 2179, at (571) 273-8300, on September 12, 2008.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: Scott M. Tulino

Scott M. Tulino, Esq.
Reg. No. 48,317

Sean M. McGinn, Esq.
Reg. No. 34,386